



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,884	12/03/2001	Ibrahim Cem Duruoz	020699-000510US	7984
37490	7590	09/07/2005	EXAMINER	
CARPENTER & KULAS, LLP 1900 EMBARCADERO ROAD SUITE 109 PALO ALTO, CA 94303			HO, ANDY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2194	

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/005,884

Applicant(s)

DURUOZ ET AL

Examiner

Andy Ho

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 13-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 13-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

20

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed 6/13/2005.
2. Claims 1-10 and 13-62 have been examined and are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 29-35 and 40-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ludwig U.S Patent No. 6,816,904.

As to claim 29, Ludwig teaches an application programming interface (API, line 4 column 10; AVSC 120 and AVSM 100, Fig. 3; lines 46-61 column 19) for providing an interface with an audio/video file system (Audio/Video server system 100, lines 44-45 column 7) capable of handling and organizing audio/video data (comprises a repository for AV file storage and processing resources, lines 9-10 column 12), comprising:

a device (one of the user workstations 40, Figs. 3; Fig. 37) adapted to select a first set of function calls to manipulate said audio/video filing system when a first file

Art Unit: 2194

type is detected and to select a second set of function calls to manipulate said audio/video filing system when a second file type is detected (function calls to access the A/V file system, line 4 column 21 to line 31 column 22; lines 46-61 column 19; multiple types of files including audio, video, graphics, text..., lines 44-53 column 22); said a first plurality of function calls (function calls to access the A/V file system, line 4 column 21 to line 31 column 22; lines 46-61 column 19) including:

- a load function call designed to cause retrieval of descriptor information (retrieving files, line 39 column 19) from a storage medium (a repository for A/V file storage, lines 9-10 column 12);

- a store function call designed to cause storing of said descriptor information (file administration operations such storage of A/V and multimedia files, lines 40-42 column 7) onto said storage medium (a repository for A/V file storage, lines 9-10 column 12);

- a delete function call designed to cause deletion of said descriptor information (file administration operations such deletion of A/V and multimedia files, lines 40-42 column 7) from said storage medium (a repository for A/V file storage, lines 9-10 column 12); and

- a second plurality of function calls including (function calls to access the A/V file system, line 4 column 21 to line 31 column 22; lines 46-61 column 19):

- a play function call designed to cause a specified file to be played (A/V file recording and playback, lines 37-47 column 21);

- a record function call designed to cause specified data to be recorded (A/V file recording and playback, lines 37-47 column 21); and

a stop function call designed to cause a play or record operation to be stopped (stop operation on the file, line 23 column 22).

As to claim 30, Ludwig further teaches said first and second plurality of function calls is designed to handle a first and second type of files (multiple types of files, lines 44-53 column 22).

As to claim 31, Ludwig further teaches first type of file is a non-audio/video file (application files, line 52 column 22); and second type of file is an audio/video file (A/V files, line 44 column 22).

As to claim 32, Ludwig further teaches said first plurality of function calls further includes: a validity function call designed to verify validity of a specified descriptor (...AVSC validation operations, through which the AVSM 160 queries each AVSC 120 to determine the number, type, and capabilities of the AVSC's storage, encoding, decoding, and transcoding resources..., lines 40-43 column 36); and

said second plurality of function calls further includes: a pause function call designed to cause a play or record operation to be paused (pause operation on the file, line 24 column 22); a resume function call designed to cause a previously paused operation to resume (resume operation on the file, line 15 column 40); and an address retrieval function call designed to determine a logical block address of said specified file during a play or a record operation (operation to obtain A/V file's storage location or address, lines 63-67 column 31).

As to claim 33, Ludwig further teaches a plurality of function calls designed to cause forward operations to be performed (fast forward, line 24 column 22; skip

Art Unit: 2194

forward, line 41 column 24; fast forward, rewind, or similar operations, lines 32-33 column 45); and a plurality of function calls designed to cause reverse operations to be performed (rewind, line 24 column 22; rewind to beginning, line 35-36 column 24; skip back, line 36 column 24; fast forward, rewind, or similar operations, lines 32-33 column 45).

As to claim 34, Ludwig further teaches a fast-forward (fast forward, line 24 column 22), a slow-forward (fast forward, rewind, or similar operations, lines 32-33 column 45), and a step-forward (skip forward, line 41 column 24).

As to claim 35, Ludwig further teaches a fast-reverse (rewind, line 24 column 22), a slow-reverse (fast forward, rewind, or similar operations, lines 32-33 column 45), and a step-reverse (skip back, line 36 column 24).

As to claims 40-43, Ludwig further teaches (lines 39-46 column 36) the specified descriptor is an object descriptor, a content list, a performance list, a HMS table.

As to claim 44, Ludwig further teaches said first and second plurality of function calls is capable of passing a plurality of parameters (administrative parameters, lines 29-61 column 16).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2194

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 45-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludwig.

As to claims 45-60, Ludwig as disclosed in claims 29 and 32-35 above teaches the system performs function calls. Ludwig does not explicitly teach specific parameters being passed by a specific function call. However, Ludwig teaches the function calls are being implemented by passing parameters (lines 29-61 column 16; lines 16-61 column 19; lines 30-46 column 37). Therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would conclude the function calls of Ludwig are capable of passing specific parameters because this allows the system to perform the function calls such as load, store, delete, play...as disclosed by Ludwig.

5. Claims 1-10, 13-28, 36-39 and 61-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludwig in view of Blumel U.S Patent No. 6,859,610.

As to claim 1, Ludwig teaches an application programming interface (API, line 4 column 10; AVSC 120 and AVSM 100, Fig. 3; lines 46-61 column 19) for handling interaction with an audio/video filing system (Audio/Video server system 100, lines 44-45 column 7) capable of handling and organizing audio/video data (comprises a repository for A/V file storage and processing resources, lines 9-10 column 12) comprising:

a first interface which controls transfer of information (...through which client application programs may request A/V and/or multimedia switching and/or conferencing services..., lines 4-6 column 10) between a first device (one of the user workstations 40, Figs. 3; Fig. 37) capable of handling data (...each workstation includes video and audio reproduction capabilities, as well as video and audio capture capabilities..., lines 17-19 column 3) and said audio/video file system (Audio/Video server system 100, lines 44-45 column 7); said first device adapted to select a first set of function calls to manipulate said audio/video filing system when a first file type is detected and to select a second set of function calls to manipulate said audio/video filing system when a second file type is detected (function calls to access the A/V file system, line 4 column 21 to line 31 column 22; lines 46-61 column 19; multiple types of files including audio, video, graphics, text..., lines 44-53 column 22).

Ludwig as disclosed above teaches the device can handle audio/video data. However, Ludwig does not explicitly teach the data is isochronous and asynchronous. Blumel teaches a system in which an audio/video device could transfer isochronous and asynchronous data based on the standard of IEEE-1394 protocol (lines 1-10 column 4). It would have been obvious to apply the teachings of Blumel to the system of Ludwig because an audio/video device that could handle isochronous and asynchronous data is well known in the art as disclosed by Blumel (lines 1-10 column 4). The system of Ludwig as modified by Blumel would include the audio/video workstations are being able to handle isochronous and asynchronous data.

As to claim 2, Ludwig as modified further teaches a second interface which controls transfer of information (...through which client application programs may request A/V and/or multimedia switching and/or conferencing services..., lines 4-6 column 10) between a second device (one of the user workstations 40, Figs. 3; Fig. 37) capable of handling data (...each workstation includes video and audio reproduction capabilities, as well as video and audio capture capabilities..., lines 17-19 column 3) and said audio/video file system (Audio/Video server system 100, lines 44-45 column 7). Note claim 1 above for the discussion of asynchronous data and the reason of combining references.

As to claim 3, Ludwig as modified further teaches the first device is an audio/video controller (...each workstation includes video and audio reproduction capabilities, as well as video and audio capture capabilities..., lines 17-19 column 3).

As to claim 4, Blumel further teaches the device is capable of processing commands transmitted using protocol 61883 (IEC61883, line 5 column 4). Note the discussion of claim 1 above for the reason of combining references.

As to claim 5, it is an application programming interface claim of claims 1 and 4. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 4 above.

As to claim 6, Ludwig as modified further teaches second device is a SBP-2 controller (receiving commands via serial ports, lines 29-30 column 9).

As to claim 7, Ludwig as modified further teaches the SBP-2 controller is capable of processing commands transmitted using serial-bus-protocol-2 (receiving commands via serial ports, lines 29-30 column 9).

As to claim 8, it is an application programming interface claim of claims 2 and 7.

Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claims 2 and 7 above.

As to claim 9, Ludwig as modified further teaches the control of transfer of information to and from said first device is independent of internal implementation of said first device (the separation of the workstations from the AVNM 1810 and the AVSS 1816, Fig. 37).

As to claim 10, Ludwig as modified further teaches the control of transfer of information to and from said second device is independent of internal implementation of said second device (the separation of the workstations from the AVNM 1810 and the AVSS 1816, Fig. 37).

As to claim 13, Ludwig as modified further teaches first type of file is a non-audio/video file (application files, line 52 column 22); and second type of file is an audio/video file (A/V files, line 44 column 22).

As to claim 14, Ludwig as modified further teaches said first type of file is smaller than said second type of file (files, that are not A/V files, are being smaller than the A/V files, lines 32-53 column 22).

As to claim 15, Ludwig as modified further teaches one or more of said plurality of function calls are designed to allow said audio/video file system to play or record a plurality of audio/video data streams concurrently (A/V file recording and playback, lines 37-47 column 21).

As to claim 16, Ludwig as modified further teaches using a channel ID parameter and an object ID parameter (administrative parameters, lines 29-61 column 16).

As to claims 17-18, they are application programming interface claims of claims 15-16, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 15-16 above.

As to claims 19-20, they are application programming interface claims of claims 15-16, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 15-16 above.

As to claim 21, Ludwig as modified further teaches one or more said plurality of function calls are designed to allow said audio/video file system to optimize disk access (function calls to access the A/V file system, line 4 column 21 to line 31 column 22; lines 46-61 column 19).

As to claim 22, it is an application programming interface claim of claims 12 and 21. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claims 12 and 21 above.

As to claims 23-24, they are application programming interface claims of claims 13 and 15, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 13 and 15 above.

As to claim 25, Ludwig as modified further teaches forward operations (fast forward, line 24 column 22; skip forward, line 41 column 24; fast forward, rewind, or similar operations, lines 32-33 column 45).

As to claim 26, Ludwig as modified further teaches a fast-forward operation (fast forward, line 24 column 22), a slow-forward operation (fast forward, rewind, or similar operations, lines 32-33 column 45), and a step-forward operation (skip forward, line 41 column 24).

As to claim 27, Ludwig as modified further teaches reverse operations (rewind, line 24 column 22; rewind to beginning, line 35-36 column 24; skip back, line 36 column 24; fast forward, rewind, or similar operations, lines 32-33 column 45).

As to claim 28, Ludwig as modified further teaches a fast-reverse operation (rewind, line 24 column 22), a slow-reverse operation (fast forward, rewind, or similar operations, lines 32-33 column 45), and a step-reverse operation (skip back, line 36 column 24).

As to claims 36-39, they are application programming interface claims of claims 1, 3, 2 and 6, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 3, 2 and 6 above.

As to claim 61, it is a method claim of claims 1-2. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1-2 above.

As to claim 62, it is a method claim of claims 9-10. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claims 9-10 above.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 6/13/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that Ludwig reference does not teach an API that handles interaction with the audio/video filing system (Remarks, sixth paragraph page 15 continue to first incomplete paragraph page 16). In response, as disclosed in the claim rejection above, Ludwig clearly teaches the API allows the client application programs to interact with the audio/video filing system such as: requesting A/V or multimedia switching or conferencing services (lines 2-6 column 10). The reference meets the limitation as claimed.

Applicant argued that Ludwig reference does not teach an API includes a first interface which controls transfer of information between a first device that handles both isochronous and asynchronous data (Remarks, first complete paragraph page 16). In response, while the applicant argued the Ludwig reference does not teach this limitation, the applicant did not disclose any details of how the cited portions from Ludwig reference as disclosed in the claim rejection above did not met the claim limitations. As clearly disclosed above, Ludwig teaches an application programming interface (API, line 4 column 10; AVSC 120 and AVSM 100, Fig. 3; lines 46-61 column 19) comprising a first interface which controls transfer of information (...through which client application programs may request A/V and/or multimedia switching and/or conferencing services..., lines 4-6 column 10) between a first device (one of the user workstations 40, Figs. 3; Fig. 37) capable of handling data (...each workstation includes video and audio reproduction capabilities, as well as video and audio capture capabilities..., lines 17-19 column 3). Ludwig as disclosed teaches the device can handle audio/video data. However, Ludwig does not explicitly teach the data is

isochronous and asynchronous. Blumel teaches a system in which an audio/video device could transfer isochronous and asynchronous data based on the standard of IEEE-1394 protocol (lines 1-10 column 4). It would have been obvious to apply the teachings of Blumel to the system of Ludwig because an audio/video device that could handle isochronous and asynchronous data is well known in the art as disclosed by Blumel (lines 1-10 column 4). The system of Ludwig as modified by Blumel would include the audio/video workstations are being able to handle isochronous and asynchronous data.

Applicant argued that the cited references do not teach limitations such as: the first device can select...file type is detected, a second interface...file system... (Remarks, second and third complete paragraphs page 16). Again, while the applicant argued the cited references do not teach these limitations, the applicant did not disclose any details of how the cited portions from the cited references as disclosed in the claim rejection above did not met these claim limitations. Note the claim rejections above for the discussions of how the cited references met these claim limitations.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andy Ho whose telephone number is (571) 272-3762. A voice mail service is also available for this number. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday, 8:30 am – 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIM) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents


P.O Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or fax to:

- AFTER-FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to (571) 273 - 8300.
- OFFICAL faxes must be signed and sent to (571) 273 - 8300.
- NON OFFICAL faxes should not be signed, please send to (571) 273 - 3762

A.H
August 31, 2005


MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER